

REMARKS

Claim 18, as rewritten in independent form, includes the additional feature: "wherein said region in which the laser source is located comprises a back surface of the first substrate, and wherein the back surface of the first substrate is opposite the front surface of the first substrate".

Claims 22, 25, and 26 have been rewritten in independent form and are otherwise the same claims as were originally filed.

The Examiner indicated that claims 1-16 and 29-40 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 17-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Laor, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0009270A1.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 17-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Laor, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0009270A1.

Since claim 17, has been cancelled, the rejection of claim 17 is moot.

Claims 18-21, 23-24, and 27-28

Applicants respectfully contend that Laor does not anticipate claim 18, because Laor does not teach each and every feature of claim 18. For example, Laor does not teach the feature: "wherein said region in which the laser source is located comprises a back surface of the first substrate, and wherein the back surface of the first substrate is opposite the front surface of the first substrate".

Applicants maintain that FIG. 5 of Laor shows that the optical port 39 in which the VCSEL is located does not comprise the back surface of the substrate (i.e, chip 40) but instead comprises the front surface to which the optical fiber 24 is attached.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Laor does not anticipate claim 18, and that claim 18 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 19-21, 23-24, and 27-28 depend from claim 18, Applicants contend that claims 19-21, 23-24, and 27-28 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claim 22

Applicants respectfully contend that Laor does not anticipate claim 22, because Laor does not teach each and every feature of claim 22. For example, Laor does not teach the feature:

10/608,057

15

"wherein the front surface of the first substrate and the front surface of the second substrate are at a nonzero angle with respect to each other such that the nonzero angle is unequal to 90 degrees"

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Laor does not anticipate claim 22, and that claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 25

Applicants respectfully contend that Laor does not anticipate claim 25, because Laor does not teach each and every feature of claim 25. For example, Laor does not teach the feature:

"wherein the first substrate comprises a first material that is substantially transparent to the laser radiation, and wherein the second substrate comprises a second material that is substantially transparent to the laser radiation, and wherein the second material differs from the first material"

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Laor does not anticipate claim 25, and that claim 25 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 26

Applicants respectfully contend that Laor does not anticipate claim 26, because Laor does not teach each and every feature of claim 26. For example, Laor does not teach the feature:

"wherein the first substrate comprises a material that is substantially transparent to the laser radiation, and wherein the second substrate comprises the material"

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Laor does not anticipate claim 26, and that claim 26 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 12/27/2004

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688